

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 25, 2005, the specification and claims were objected to; and claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,615,258 (Barry).

The specification and claims have been amended to address the objections.

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 11 is not disclosed by Barry. Claim 11 recites a software system comprising an application, a sub-system to interact with the application, and an interceptor system between the application and sub-system. The interceptor system includes a proxy to interact with the application, a first customization module providing a first customization, the first customization module to interact with the proxy, and a dispatcher to interact with the customization module and with the sub-system. Further, a second customization module provides a second customization, the second customization module to interact with the proxy and the dispatcher, where the interceptor system enables the *addition* of the second customization module to the interceptor system *while the application is running*.

The ability to add a customization module to an interceptor system while an application is running, as recited in claim 11, is not disclosed anywhere in Barry. The Office Action cited to Fig. 10 of Barry and accompanying text passages of Barry in the rejection of claim 11. Fig. 10 of Barry describes a WWW/Internet reporting system (WRS) that includes various client applications (212, 215, 210, 280), a middle tier including a report manager 250, a report scheduler 260, an Inbox server 270, and order entry server 39. The Office Action identified the application proxy components mentioned at lines 26-27 of column 21 of Barry as being the customization module of claim 11. The Office Action also cited an Inbox proxy 270' (column 28, lines 49-52) of Barry as being the proxy recited in claim 11. However, there is no indication whatsoever in Barry that any of the application proxy components depicted in Fig. 10 of Barry (or in any other figure of Barry) is added to an interceptor system (between an application and sub-system) while the application is running, as recited in claim 11.

Therefore, claim 11 is not anticipated by Barry.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to recite that an interceptor system includes a first customization module and that a customization repository contains a second customization module, where a customization control is able to add the second customization module to the

interceptor system *while the application is running*. As discussed above with respect to claim 11, this feature of claim 9 is clearly not disclosed by Barry.

Independent claim 1 is also allowable over Barry. Claim 1 recites an interceptor system including a proxy, a customization module, and a dispatcher. Claim 1 also recites a customization repository for containing *the* customization module. With respect to claim 1, the Office Action cited a database 258 (see Fig. 10 of Barry) described in column 22, lines 33-37, of Barry, as being the customization repository of claim 1. Note that the database 258 of Barry provides “accounting of metadata and user report inventory.” Barry, 22:33-35. There is no indication that this database 258 stores the customization module that is part of the interceptor system of claim 1, where such customization module provides a customization and has an interaction with a proxy.

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 10, the database 258 of Barry does not contain customization modules that are part of an interceptor system, where the customization modules provide customizations for a plurality of non-functional properties of a computer system.

Amended independent claim 19 is also allowable over Barry. Claim 19 recites an interceptor system having a customization module that performs a non-functional operation of a software system and that has an interaction with a proxy. Claim 19 recites that the non-functional operation comprises a failover operation. The components depicted in Fig. 10 of Barry identified by the Office Action as being the customization module of claim 19 do not perform a failover operation. Therefore, claim 19 is not anticipated by Barry.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite that non-functional properties of a plurality of customization modules comprise at least failure masking and performance measurement. There is no indication that the components of Fig. 10 of Barry perform failure masking and performance measurement.

Dependent claims, including newly added dependent claims 21-28, are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

Appln. Serial No. 10/037,107
Amendment Dated June 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action Mailed March 25, 2005

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (10006790-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2005



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883